that as my questions were called from the Chair and disposed of there would be no longer any need for my presence in the Assembly.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have heard the explanation of the Hon'ble the Home Minister. Although the remarks which I made on Saturday arose in connection with a question relating to the Department of the Minister for Home and Industries, I may state that my remarks were in the nature of a general observation. Rule 24 runs as follows:—

> "the first hour of every day of meeting shall be available for the asking and answering of questions."

Then rule 32 is as follows:—

> "When all the questions for which answer is desired have been called, the Speaker may, if time permits, call again any question which has not been put by reason of the absence of the member in whose name it stands, and may also permit a member to put a question standing in the name of another member, if so authorised by him."

This is the procedure. Since a large number of questions were not taken up due to the absence of some members in the morning, as per rule 32, I called such of the members who came in just then to put questions if they so desired. This is one thing.

While the Revenue Minister was making or made an attempt to answer a question put by one of the Hon'ble Members, the actual remark that I made on that day is as follows:—

> "The difficulty is the Revenue Minister is not in charge of the Department. He is not briefed to answer this question. . . ."

This is obvious from the statement or rather the explanation made by the Hon'ble Minister himself, namely, that since there were no more questions of his he left the House since his presence in the other House was urgent. I added:

> ". . . I am sorry to say in this connection that if the other Ministers are in the other House that could be excused; otherwise I do not know what to say."

It will thus be seen that my remarks related to those Ministers who were neither in this House nor in the Council and whose questions could not be taken up due to their absence.

Demands for Supplementary Grants for 1953-54.

(Time fixed for Discussion).

Mr. SPEAKER.—As regards supplementary estimates, I suppose copies have been distributed?

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR (T.-Narsipur).—Yes.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—I would like to know whether supplementary demands would be taken up?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is noted in the agenda itself that it will be taken up to-day at 5 P.M.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Then, where is the time for us to send notice of cut motions? We are empowered to send cut motions on Budget demands. The rules provide for three days' time being given to us to send notices of cut motions. So for three days after the presentation of demands, they cannot be taken up unless the Chair . . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will make a statement regarding that. Hon'ble Members might have noticed that certain demands for additional and supplementary grants for the year 1953-54 have been included in to-day's list of business. As copies of the motions and statement of supplementary estimates were not given to the members sufficiently in advance, it was not perhaps possible for them to give notice of cut motions. Normally, it is desirable that demands for supplementary grants should be available to the members well in time to enable them to study the estimates and to table cut motions, if any. However, on the present occasion, it will be seen that without exception every demand for a supplementary grant is in the nature of a token demand.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—It is very dangerous.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes, just wait. The amounts required in all these cases are proposed to be met by re-appropriation. The only circumstance which required that these demands should come up before the House was the fact that the expenditure incurred was in respect of what is called 'new service'. The expression 'new service' is to be found in Article 250 of the Constitution but there is no definition of this expression in the Constitution or elsewhere. The Public Accounts Committee which reported on the Audit and Appropriation Accounts of 1949-50 have accepted the note prepared by the Finance Department and appended to that report a note regarding the interpretation of this term. According to that interpretation *inter alia* where certain expenditure exceeds the amounts specified therein, it has to be treated as a 'new service'. The value of defining the expression 'new service' so as to include certain items of expenditure is that it enables the Legislature to be informed of these items of expenditure and to have an opportunity to debate them. In all the cases which will come up before this House later to-day it is not that the vote of the Legislature is required for the money since the money is met by re-appropriation but that an opportunity is afforded to the Legislature to discuss the desirability or otherwise of undertaking such expenditure. It was in this view, in order that Hon'ble Members might have an opportunity to debate these items of expenditure and in order to satisfy the recommendation of the earlier Public Accounts Committee that I have permitted the inclusion of these motions in today's list of business. I am sure that the Hon'ble Members will be able to discuss these demands even though they have had no opportunity of tabling cut motions. I might add that so far as these token demands are concerned, it is more usual to debate on the demand itself than to move cut motions, since the demand itself relates to specific items of expenditure and is not in the nature of a comprehensive grant such as comes up before the Legislature when the main estimates are voted.

Now, if the House so desires, we will take up these estimates for discussion after five of the Clock.

BUDGET FOR 1954-55—DEMANDS FOR GRANTS

Mr. SPEAKER.—As regards the demands, the timings I have noted are as follows:—

Demand No. 38	...	1-15 to 1-45
Demand No. 39	...	1-45 to 2
Demand No. 40	...	2 to 2-30
Demand No. 42	...	2-30 to 3
Demand No. 44	...	3-30 to 4
Demand No. 45	...	4 to 5

DEMAND No. 38.—WORKING EXPENSES—ELECTRICITY SCHEMES

XLI. RECEIPTS FROM ELECTRICITY SCHEMES

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,60,64,400 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1955, in respect of 'Receipts from Electricity Schemes—Working Expenses'."

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR (T.-Narasipur).—Sir, I oppose the Demand. On the policy of rural electrification, I would like to submit to the House that the method adopted by the Government is far from satisfactory. There are many schemes already sanctioned relating to some districts. In some other districts schemes are not at all taken up. In certain districts not more than three or four works are taken up while in some other districts 10 to 20 works are taken. Since there are a large number of sanctioned estimates pending execution, no new schemes can be taken up in other districts because the works already sanctioned